

FERNALD CITIZENS TASK FORCE

A U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

Chair:

John S. Applegate

Members:

James Bierer
Marvin Clawson
Lisa Crawford
Pam Dunn
Dr. Constance Fox
Guy Guckenberger
Darryl Huff
Jerry Monahan
Tom B. Rentschler
Robert Tabor
Warren E. Strunk
Thomas Wagner
Dr. Gene Willeke

Alternates:

Russ Beckner
Jackie Embry

Ex Officio:

J. Phillip Hamric
Graham Mitchell
Jim Saric

Minutes from January 15, 1994 Meeting

Members Present:

John Applegate
Jim Bierer
Marvin Clawson
Lisa Crawford
Pam Dunn
Guy Guckenberger
Phil Hamric, DOE
Darryl Huff
Graham Mitchell, OEPA
Jerry Monahan
Tom Rentschler
Warren Strunk
Robert Tabor
Thomas Wagner
Gene Willeke

About 12 spectators, including members of public, DOE, and FERMCO representatives.

1. Approval of Minutes:

- The draft minutes of the December 9, 1993, meeting of the Task Force were approved without amendment.

2. Remarks:

Task Force Chair John Applegate reported that he met with DOE and EPA Headquarters officials in Washington, D.C., on January 12, 1994. He said DOE and EPA are eager to support the Task Force.

3. Change in Agenda:

Task Force members agreed to modify the agenda to have the discussion of future land use options precede the discussion of the draft

proposed activities and process for the Task Force.

4. Discussion of Visit by Assistant Secretary Grumbly:

Applegate reported on the visit to Fernald of Assistant Secretary Tom Grumbly on January 13 for members who were unable to attend the session with Grumbly. Grumbly was very supportive of the Task Force mission, in particular the future use approach, and he also asked the Task Force to address risk assessment and budget issues.

Applegate said he has asked Doug Sarno to think about how we might work these projects into the Task Force's current schedule. Applegate also said he thought it was encouraging that Grumbly asked the Task Force to consider these issues.

Guy Guckenberger said he had some concern about the Task Force's being distracted from other pressing topics. He said the Task Force's mission is daunting enough without diverting attention to these issues.

Tom Rentschler asked that Grumbly's comments be recorded in the Task Force's minutes. He said the Task Force certainly should have 1994 and future budget figures, as well as budget information for some previous years. He said that the budget is a policy issue that will impact what the Task Force does.

Applegate agreed, but said that he doesn't see either of these as immediate issues.

5. Introduction of New FERMCO Management Team

Applegate introduced members of the new FERMCO management team. FERMCO appointed an "action team" on December 15, 1993, to intensify its management efforts at Fernald. The action team includes William Breen, Sheila Little, and John Bradburne, who are executives of Fluor Daniel, Inc. Breen heads the action team; Little will focus her attention on outreach activities with key stakeholders, and Bradburne will serve as special assistant to the chairman and chief executive officer of Fluor Corporation to ensure effective and timely communications. Former FERMCO President Nick Kaufman has accepted other responsibilities with Fluor Daniel, FERMCO's parent company.

6. Discussion of Future Land Use Options:

Doug Sarno, the Task Force's consultant, introduced the discussion of future land use options for the Fernald site. He said it was to be a "brainstorming" session to get the maximum number of ideas on the table. In brainstorming sessions, there are three ground rules for the discussion: 1) All ideas are valid; 2) Everyone speaks, and 3) No cross talk about ideas among members. Bob Tabor suggested that discussion go around the table.

Task Force members then offered ideas for future land use. The options include:

- Industrial Park
- Residential
- Site will be split
- North/South - Storage
- Recreational
- Museum of Nuclear Power Energy
- Education, History
- Wildflowers, scenic preserve
- Extended Employment - Atomic "Deprocessor"
- Natural Ecosystem Preserve
- Research facility
- Agriculture, grazing
- Memorial park/cemetery
- Storage facility for wastes
- Industrial - Use of existing infrastructure
- Disposal facility
- Technology and development - research facility
- Memorial to site activities
- DOE control forever
- Police/fire/CPR training facility
- Waste cells in northern part of site, away from groundwater
- Trees/sanctuary
- Hospital - national focus
- Reading room/accessible historical
- Wetlands/Preserve/Research
- Limited access/DOE control
- Focus on not repeating mistakes
- Tax base protected under any ownership
- Park
- Multiple uses
- Reduce physical barriers

- Government offices
- Restricted from materials brought in from off site
- Paddy's Run undisturbed
- Wetlands/Natural Areas Preserved
- Existing infrastructure contaminated
- Power Plant (gas, nuclear)
- Creation of trust for control
- Yard waste/composting
- Connection to Great Miami River
- Increase public access/green space
- Centralized training/education center
- Centered on nuclear/environmental education
- Both government and private
- Pristine cleanup
- Ecology center
- Get to the point of no negative impacts
- Let nature take over/green space
- Gives back to community
- Rail system on direction
- Low level rad disposal
- Self supporting/non DOE facility
- Do not preclude better cleanup in the future
- Federal government (not necessarily DOE) control/responsibility
- regardless of owner
- Oversight and responsibility
- All uses should have acceptable risk
- Federal penitentiary
- Waste Water Treatment facility
- Build on existing technology and infrastructure
- Fed. Fac. Comp. Act. Treatment Center
- Public school
- Water processing/water sales
- Preserve site history - research
- Educational tools created
- Archives, DOE records
- Warehouses
- Uses over time may change
- Recycling center
- Any process should be non-hazardous
- Laboratory
- Full health care retirement village
- Creation of environmental monitoring zone/research
- Vocational training, community college
- Identify significant natural areas

- Expand and connect with existing off-site uses
- No increase in risk
- No further defacement of environment
- Must be reconciled with local zoning/planning
- Must include input from public at large
Beyond five-mile radius

(The ● indicates potential future uses, while the ■ represents those future use possibilities considered criteria by Task Force members)

Sarno told Task Force members that this list is not to be considered exhaustive, and members may continue to add potential options throughout the discussion of future use. Sarno said he will classify the future use options in terms of passive (e.g., waste disposal) and active (e.g., waste treatment) uses. The Task Force also will begin considering risk-based standards for these various uses by looking at the cleanup levels required to achieve the particular use.

At its February 12 meeting, the Task Force will continue the process of identifying and analyzing future use options for Fernald. Specifically, Task Force members will begin to refine the list of criteria to be applied to future uses of the site and to identify which criteria are most important.

Jim Bierer suggested that the Task Force contact other stakeholders and keep them informed about the Task Force's discussions. Tom Rentschler said he has done some informal surveying among Hamilton residents and has found that most people do not know about the Task Force's mission. Guy Guckenberger said that any information disseminated by the Task Force should be nontechnical.

Phil Hamric endorsed the idea of communicating with a wide range of stakeholders. He explained that DOE is in the process of putting forth a new set of values for the agency, and that one of those values requires stakeholder involvement. He said DOE will be required to have a strategy indicating how it will achieve stakeholder involvement.

Upon request of the chair, some members of the audience volunteered potential options during the Task Force's discussion of future land use at Fernald. Those ideas include:

- Transportation hub
- Sports complex - community or professional

- Regional Airport

7. Discussion of the Proposed Activities and Process:

Applegate prefaced the discussion by pointing out that the legally mandated process requires dozens of separate documents leading up to final remedial decisions. The quickest route to irrelevance is for the Task Force to become consumed with these documents. The Task Force should resist pressure to respond to individual pieces of paper and comment periods, although Task Force members as individuals were always encouraged to do so. Applegate said that the Task Force is a little behind in decisionmaking because it was convened late, but the timeline that Sarno will present should compensate.

Sarno said the goal was to identify key points in the DOE decisionmaking process and to have the Task Force fit into that process. He said the Task Force has completed the first two phases of its work, convening and orientation. The Task Force now is in its third phase, Cleanup Parameters.

In this phase, Sarno said the Task Force will look at the universe of possibilities, the feasibility of each future use option, and the technology required to achieve a particular future use. The Task Force will go through a screening process and develop reasonable alternatives, with full understanding of the cost and technologies that it will take to achieve the various alternatives.

Sarno said the Task Force would be able to deliver its recommendation on future use by the end of the year.

In Phase IV, the Task Force will look at the ramifications of the cleanup recommendation it has developed. Sarno said there will be a lot of work related to prioritizing what the site will look like over time, at 10-, 25-, and 50-year intervals. Among the issues to be considered in this phase are:

- What will the site look like during construction?
- What will the site look like when construction is complete?
- What about future generations? How will they deal with the site? How will we leave behind the right legacy and controls, after DOE has finished its work and "gone away?"
- Who should control the site? Who should own the site?
- How should the issue of long-term protection be addressed?

- How will we ensure this?

Sarno said the Task Force also will need to establish priorities, which ties into Grumbly's request for help in the budgeting process.

Lisa Crawford said the proposed activities and process clarified the road the Task Force needed to take and how to fulfill its mission. Rentschler said he hoped the process resulted in tangible feedback from DOE, adding that he would like DOE to demonstrate its responsiveness periodically.

Sarno said DOE would not sit in a vacuum while the Task Force issued its report, adding that the Task Force has a good working relationship with DOE at the table. Because DOE sits at the table with the Task Force, there will be feedback as the future use recommendation is developed. Moreover, he said, Task Force members should not divorce themselves from whom they represent. But Task Force members also should not feel pressure to stay with the positions of their constituencies just because those are the groups they represent. The balance, Sarno said, is to avoid not budging over positional issues while not ignoring the people represented by Task Force members. Sarno described the process as participatory democracy.

Applegate said he and Sarno were developing ways for Task Force members to report back to their constituencies. Bierer added that Task Force members have a commitment to citizens in the area, and he suggested that the proposed activities and process be communicated to the public. Bierer also said that the public should be told how to contact members of the Task Force.

Hamric said DOE will help with implementation of any communication plan. He also said that DOE intended to be responsiveness to the Task Force.

Marvin Clawson asked how the budget issue would fit into the proposed activities and process. Sarno said the budget would be tackled as part of the priority-setting phase, which he explained was the most powerful way to affect the budget process.

Jerry Monahan said he thought Grumbly said during his visit to Fernald that the budget would be decided separately. Applegate said Grumbly was talking about two different levels of budgets. The Task Force probably will not have a lot of impact on how much total money will go to the Fernald site. But the Task Force can help determine -- as

part of its priority-setting function -- how that money will be spent at Fernald.

Tom Wagner said Grumbly's comments on the budget bothered him because he cannot think of a faster way to be rendered irrelevant than by getting into the budget. He said he didn't think anyone understood the budget, adding that he endorsed Sarno's approach because the Task Force did not need to get down to the level of how much money is spent on educational programs, travel, etc.

Sarno said he thought Grumbly wanted priorities, which is what he meant by his remarks on the budget.

Gene Willeke said it might be good if the Task Force were to look into ways work can be accelerated at Fernald. He said the Task Force should try to ensure that Fernald is not short-timed.

Pam Dunn said she didn't think the Task Force was asked by Grumbly to look at DOE's entire budget. But she said she thought the Task Force should look at the site's budget, adding that as more sites begin remediation activities, there will be smaller pieces of the budget pie.

Sarno said the timing of the proposed activities and process for the Task Force reflected two deliverables: an interim report on future land use and a final report with all the recommendations. He said that although there were lots of Records of Decisions coming up for the Fernald cleanup, they do not necessarily impact the ultimate future use of the site. (A Record of Decision is the final decision on the cleanup remedy.) The Operable Unit 3 Interim Record of Decision addresses the buildings; the Operable Unit 4 Record of Decision addresses the source materials in the K-65 Silos, and the Operable Unit 1 Record of Decision addresses the contents of the waste pits. The Record of Decision for Operable Unit 5 and the final Record of Decision for Operable Unit 3 are the key milestones because they determine the fate of the soil and debris.

Sarno said the schedule for Operable Unit 2 was a problem because the draft Record of Decision is being developed in July 1994 and it will have a final recommendation for soil. That recommendation could be determined before the Task Force reaches its recommendation on future use.

Sarno said the Task Force may want to request of EPA that the internal deadlines for Operable Unit 2 be relaxed, although the final deadline

for the Record of Decision probably would not have to be changed.

Clawson asked whether the Task Force had the authority to change deadlines. Sarno said it did not, but that the Task Force can ask EPA to wait on a draft proposed plan for Operable Unit 2 until the Task Force makes its recommendation. Asking EPA to delay a draft document is not asking the cleanup to slow down.

Applegate said such a request would be most effective if it comes from the Task Force as a formal action. Crawford and Willeke suggested that the Task Force be provided with an analysis of the impacts from changing Operable Unit 2's schedule. Crawford asked for the analysis to be presented at the February Task Force meeting.

Graham Mitchell said there is a history of schedule slippage at the Fernald site, but said the Amended Consent Agreement between DOE and EPA allows for slippage only if there is a good reason. He said the request deserves consideration, adding that Operable Unit 2's cleanup remedy is likely to propose on-site disposal.

Applegate said he will approach DOE, EPA, Ohio EPA and FERMCO to discuss the request and to get an analysis of the implications of changing the Operable Unit 2 schedule.

8. Discussion of Meeting Times:

Applegate said there are two parameters to consider when picking a time for Task Force meetings: 1) The Task Force needs a sizeable block of time, and 2) The meetings need to be held at a regular time. he said meetings need to last about 4 hours in order to get all the work accomplished, including administrative matters, educational briefings, and the actual work on future use and other issues.

Members reached consensus on holding meetings from 8:30 a.m. until noon on the second Saturday of the month.

The location of the meetings now is the AmeriSuites in Forest Park, because the Meadowbrook cannot guarantee Saturdays for the Task Force.

9. Public Participation:

There were no other public comments other than those earlier on future use options.

10. New Business:

The Task Force agreed to ask DOE to provide information to the public about waste shipments from the Fernald site to off-site disposal locations. Task Force members decided to ask DOE to develop a plan outlining how the public will be notified in advance about the types of wastes being shipped from Fernald, how the wastes are being transported, the schedule for shipments, and the final destination of the wastes.

- Jerry Monahan moved that the Task Force ask DOE to develop a plan to notify the public about waste shipments from Fernald. Lisa Crawford seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously; Applegate said he would convey that request from the Task Force to DOE.

11. Materials Distributed at Meeting:

- Copies of aerial maps of the Fernald site
- Public comments on future use from DOE's October 1993 community meeting
- Task Force business cards
- January 1994 Fernald Cleanup Report
- Updated table of contents for briefing books

12. Next Meeting:

The next meeting of the full Task Force is scheduled for 8:30 a.m. to noon on February 12, 1994, at the AmeriSuites in Forest Park.

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Approved February 12, 1994